

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
CONTENTS

M.1	INTRODUCTION	M-1
M.2	BEST AND FINAL OFFERS	M-1
M.3	BASIS FOR DETERMINATION OF THE TECHNICAL COMPETITIVE RANGE AND AWARD	M-1
	M.3.1 Pass/Fail Criteria	M-2
M.4	TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	M-3
	M.4.1 Processing and Operating Capabilities	M-3
	M.4.2 Project Management and Implementation Capabilities	M-3
	M.4.3 Health, Safety, and Radiological Protection Capabilities	M-4
	M.4.4 Qualifications, Experience, and Technical Competence Of Proposed Personnel and the Firm	M-5
	M.4.5 Labor Management and Labor Relations Criteria	M-5
M.5	EVALUATION OF PRICE	M-6
M.6	EVALUATION OF OPTIONS	M-6

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 Introduction

The evaluation of Technical Proposals for the selection of potential contractors to be included in the technical competitive range, and the evaluation of Final Technical and Price Proposals (FT&PPs) for award, will be in accordance with the criteria set forth below. Evaluation and selection will be based on M.3, Basis for Determination of the Technical Competitive Range and Award; M.4, Technical Evaluation Criteria; and M.5, Evaluation of Final Technical and Price Proposals. FDF will select the contractor that provides the best value.

M.2 Best and Final Offers

M.2.1

Contractors are cautioned to review carefully all terms and conditions, requirements, and specifications of this solicitation prior to submission of proposals. It is FDF's intention to award this solicitation following FDF's evaluation of FT&PPs. Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) will be requested if discussions are conducted on the FT&PPs submitted. FDF may, at its sole discretion, conduct discussions and request a BAFO from only one contractor. Contractors should be aware that a complete understanding of technical and all other terms and conditions of the proposed contract should exist between the contractors and FDF at the conclusion of discussions, if conducted. Any revisions or nonconcurrence to negotiated contract terms and conditions submitted in the "Best and Final" offer will not be subject to further discussion or negotiation.

M.2.2

This provision is not intended to restrict the contractors' opportunity to revise figures, (e.g., price discounts). It is intended to preclude any misunderstanding by FDF which could result if new or revised terms and conditions are submitted in the "Best and Final" offer that have not been fully disclosed, discussed, and understood during discussions. Any changes made in the "Best and Final" offer must be substantiated and must be traceable back to the FT&PP.

M.3 Basis For Determination of the Technical Competitive Range and Award

The proposal preparation instructions contained in Section L are designed to provide guidance to the contractor concerning the type and depth of information that FDF considers necessary to conduct an informed evaluation of each proposal. A proposal may be eliminated from further consideration before detailed evaluation if it is considered so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on face value. Contractors shall also be prepared to respond to requests by FDF for oral and/or written discussions,

facility surveys, and other information requests as may be deemed necessary by the evaluation team to assist the evaluation process. Contractors should, however, rely exclusively on their written material to convey their proposals, as the need for further discussions is entirely within the discretion of FDF.

The contractors' Technical Proposals will be evaluated by a two-step process. First, proposals will be evaluated against a set of pass/fail criteria set forth in Section M.3.1 that represent the minimum requirements a contractor must satisfy. Second, proposals that satisfy the pass/fail criteria will be evaluated on technical merit as set forth in Section M.4. A technical competitive range determination will be made for proposals offering on-site treatment, and a separate technical competitive range determination will be made for proposals offering off-site treatment. The technical competitive ranges will be determined on the basis of technical and other salient factors, and will consist of proposals that are technically rated the highest. The following sections describe the pass/fail criteria and evaluation factors that will be utilized.

M.3.1 Pass/Fail Criteria

Contractors' proposals will be evaluated against a set of pass/fail criteria that represent the minimum requirements a contractor must satisfy. Any proposal that does not meet all the pass/fail criteria will be determined to be nonresponsive and will not be considered further. The contractors must demonstrate the following pass/fail criteria:

- Contractors possess a suitable safety record and recent safety performance, as defined in Section L.14;
- Contractors demonstrate experience with the proposed stabilization/solidification process, and the process has been technically developed and utilized on a commercial basis (through previous remediation experience);
- Contractors possess radiological waste experience by demonstrating at least one project summary experience under DOE radiological engineering, monitoring, control, and ALARA compliance programs;
- Contractors possess CERCLA remediation experience and ability by demonstrating at least one project summary experience in performing remediation activities at a site under a CERCLA Consent Agreement;
- Contractors possess experience and ability in use of union labor by demonstrating at least one project summary experience in performing remediation activities with the use of union labor;
- Contractors possess experience with packaging radioactive material;
- The treated waste would meet the Silo 3 WAC, as demonstrated by treatability tests conducted by the contractor using Silo 3 material (Applicable only to FT&PPs).

M.4 Technical Evaluation Criteria

Proposals that satisfy the pass/fail criteria in accordance with Section M.3.1 will be evaluated for technical merit. In conducting its evaluation of the contractors' proposals, FDF will be looking for the contractors' demonstrated capabilities and experience (see Section L.9.2.2 for a definition of "demonstrated experience"). Contractors are cautioned to fully address all technical criteria in a comprehensive and professional manner. The Technical Merit Evaluation Criteria are listed in descending order of importance as follows:

- Criterion M.4.1;
- Criterion M.4.2;
- Criterion M.4.3;
- Criterion M.4.4; and
- Criterion M.4.5.

M.4.1 Processing and Operating Capabilities

M.4.1.1

Degree of demonstrated remediation experience that the proposed stabilization/solidification process has successfully retrieved and treated waste material of a similar scale and characteristics to those of the Silo 3 material.

M.4.1.2

Demonstrated understanding of the scope of work, complexity of the work programs, and the ability to integrate complex programmatic requirements.

M.4.1.3

Feasibility of the contractor's proposed approach and capability of the proposed system to meet applicable performance criteria defined within Sections C and J of this RFP.

M.4.1.4

Contractor's demonstrated understanding of the treatment process, process control requirements, and its plans for treatability testing (or testing results, as appropriate).

M.4.2 Project Management and Implementation Capabilities

M.4.2.1

Capability to meet design, construction, start-up, operations, and interim staging schedule and submittal requirements as defined in Sections C.4.6, C.4.7, and F. Demonstrated understanding of the level of detail and time required to implement a remedial process and prepare documentation demonstrating regulatory and contractual compliance.

RFP Number F98P132339

M.4.2.2

Capability of the contractor to properly perform and manage detailed engineering design; safety basis documentation; construction, including modular construction; start-up; and a Pre-operational Assessment.

M.4.2.3

Capability of the contractor to perform and manage a project of this size and duration at a DOE-owned site.

M.4.2.4

Capability of the contractor to perform and manage a project of this size under CERCLA.

M.4.2.5

Capability of the contractor to comply with legal requirements for environmental protection. Any required new licenses, permits, or approvals, or amendments or modifications to existing licenses, permits, or approvals, will be evaluated for the level of the requirements, reasonableness of the contractor's approach to obtaining the requirements, and the risk to the Silo 3 Project of obtaining the requirements. The project risk includes the contractor's capability to comply with off-site requirements, and risks related to prior or pending enforcement actions or violations.

M.4.3 Health, Safety, and Radiological Protection Capabilities

M.4.3.1

Demonstration and degree of suitable safety record and recent safety performance as described in Attachment J.4.22 (Section L.14.2, entitled "Safety Performance Information").

M.4.3.2

Demonstrated experience and technical competence in the following:

- (1) Operating radioactive and hazardous waste retrieval and processing facilities;
- (2) ALARA compliance programs;
- (3) Radiological engineering, monitoring, control, and compliance;
- (4) Managing waste contaminated by Thorium, Uranium, Radon, and hazardous metals; and

- (5) Handling and managing a highly dispersable waste form (e.g., powdery) and respirable hazard.

M.4.3.3

Understanding and reasonableness of radiological control staff requirements.

M.4.4 Qualifications, Experience, and Technical Competence of Proposed Personnel and the Firm

M.4.4.1

Demonstrated qualifications, experience, and technical competence of the proposed key personnel (Section H.16).

M.4.4.2

Demonstrated qualifications and technical competence of the contractors to perform work on similar types of projects to include:

- (1) Waste retrieval, material handling/transfer, and process control;
- (2) Stabilization/solidification, off-gas treatment, and emissions control;
- (3) Waste sampling, analysis, and certification;
- (4) Packaging, transportation, and disposal of radioactive waste;
- (5) Reprocessing wastes that fail to meet the WAC;
- (6) Radiological protection, health and safety, and emergency preparedness; and
- (7) Cost control and schedule management.

M.4.5 Labor Management and Labor Relations Criteria

M.4.5.1

Demonstrated experience with the management of union labor forces.

M.4.5.2

Suitability of the proposed labor relations approach, including a demonstrated plan for consistent labor training and management, project/operations management, and work force transitions.

M.4.5.3

Realism of the proposed types and quantities of labor categories and resources necessary to perform all work activities.

M.5 Evaluation of Final Technical and Price Proposals

A scoring system and weighting factors have been established for the evaluation of FT&PPs. The price evaluation will constitute approximately 35 percent of the total evaluation weight. Technical merit will constitute approximately 65 percent of the total evaluation weight. FT&PPs will be evaluated for total project price and price realism. The evaluation of total project price will be of more importance than the evaluation of price realism.

M.5.1 Total Project Price

Price analysis will be based on the prices supplied in Table B.2-1, Pricing Schedule, line items 001-009. For the purpose of price evaluation, a quantity of 3,925 tons of in situ Silo 3 material will be assumed. Costs for proposed FDF-supplied FAT&LC labor, transportation by FDF from the treatment location to the disposal facility, treated waste burial costs, FDF/DOE travel and per diem costs, if applicable, and facility shutdown and dismantlement waste disposal costs at an off-site disposal facility or the OSDF, will be included in the total evaluated project price. For price evaluation purposes only, the transportation and treated waste burial costs will be calculated assuming the Nevada Test Site (NTS) as the disposal facility. If an off-site treatment facility is proposed, transportation costs to the NTS will be calculated accordingly.

M.5.2 Price Realism

FDF will evaluate the proposed prices for price realism to determine performance and schedule risk. The evaluation of total project price will be of more importance than the evaluation of price realism. The prices for line items 001-009 will be evaluated to determine whether the proposed prices of the items:

- (1) Are realistic for the work to be performed;
- (2) Reflect a clear understanding of the requirements;
- (3) Are consistent with the schedule and work plans described in the contractor's technical proposal; and
- (4) Are materially balanced between line items.

If FDF determines that the contractor's proposed prices are not realistic, FDF may, at its sole discretion, eliminate the contractor's proposal from further consideration, or enter discussions with the contractor in accordance with M.2, Best and Final Offers.

M.6 Evaluation of Options

Unless it is determined not to be in FDF's best interests, FDF will evaluate FT&PPs for award purposes by adding the total price for all option items to the total price for the basic requirement (line item 001). Evaluation of the option items will not obligate FDF to exercise any of the option items.